



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,421	12/31/2003	Jos Jaspers	200901437-1	9571
22879 7590 11/26/2010 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration 3404 E. Harmony Road Mail Stop 35 FORT COLLINS, CO 80528				
EXAMINER SHIH, HAOSHIAN				
ART UNIT 2173		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 11/26/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
ipa.mail@hp.com
laura.m.clark@hp.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/749,421
Filing Date: December 31, 2003
Appellant(s): JASPERS ET AL.

Patric G. Billig
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 09/20/2010 appealing from the Office action mailed 04/19/2010.

1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

US 7,152,207 B1	Underwood	12/19/2006
US 6,745,238 B1	Giljum	06/01/2004
US 7,299,414 B2	Maeno	11/20/2007

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10-17, 20 and 22-27 are pending in this application and have been examined in response to application amendment filed on 02/17/2010.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10-17, 20 and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Underwood et al. (Underwood, US 7,152,207 B1) in view of Giljum et al. (Giljum, US 6,745,238 B1).

As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 1, Underwood discloses a method comprising: presenting a list of different selectable components used to generate Web pages and associated

configurable parameters for each of the components (col.13, lines 1-5; fig.5-10; a list of components is displayed for defining a web site).

receiving a selection of a plurality of the different selectable components and values for associated configurable parameters for each of the plurality of the different selectable components (col.13, lines 15-19; the users are allowed to configure a web site via components presented via a "Web Definer");

automatically generating a Web page in a Web environment based at least in part, on the received selection of the plurality of the different selectable components and the received parameter values, wherein the Web page presents the plurality of the different selectable components in accordance with the received parameter values (fig.11, "660"; the defined site is created via the "Create" button);

receiving a request to publish content in the Web page (fig.13, "1305"; a user publishes new content via "Add Pages");

presenting, in response to the request to publish content, a content definition user interface adapted to receive an identification of content (fig.16, a user names the newly created page and selects a page layout);

publishing the identified content in accordance with a predefined presentation format (col.15, lines 54-57); and

receiving data corresponding to a request to navigate through links in the web page to a particular location within the Web page wherein the received data corresponding to the request to navigate does not include data identifying a navigational structure of the Web environment, wherein the request to publish content is received in

connection with a display of the particular location on a user interface and the identified content is published at the particular location (fig. 23; fig.24; col.16, lines 43-46; col.17, lines 43-50; a user selects an icon link next to a text "We put pizzazz into new product launches." to gain access to a location next to the text for the purpose of publishing a selected image in the location). Underwood does not disclose allowing access to the web page to a site administrator and allowing defined permissions to a content publisher to access selected particular location within the web page while the web page is published to permit updating of the contents by the content publisher.

In the same field of endeavor, Giljum discloses allowing access to the web page to a site administrator and allowing defined permissions to a content publisher to access selected particular location within the web page while the web page is published to permit updating of the contents by the content publisher (fig.4; col.4, lines 6-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Underwood and Giljum before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the web site developing interface taught by Underwood to include distributed control and centralized management of a website taught by Giljum with the motivation being to generate a web site creation and maintenance tool that apportions responsibility of web site creation and maintenance task to the most appropriate individuals (Giljum, col.1, lines 60-64).

As to claim 3, Underwood discloses the form comprises a plurality of entry fields, with each entry field corresponding to one of the different selectable components (fig.9, "635"; a list of selectable components is presented via a drop down menu).

As to claim 4, Underwood discloses the generated Web page is based on a template defining a presentation format for the generated Web page (col.12, lines 30-35; "template").

As to claim 8, Underwood discloses the particular location comprises a folder within a displayed folder hierarchy, with the folder hierarchy corresponding to a logical structure of the Web page (fig.14, "1405").

As to claim 10, Underwood discloses the different selectable components comprise web page components, with each web page component defining a presentation format for data on a web page (col.15, lines 60-65).

As to claim 11, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 6 above.

As to claim 12, Underwood discloses the content includes at least one link to a web page (col.7, lines 1-5; "links").

As to claim 13, Underwood discloses receiving a request to modify a logical structure of the Web page; modifying the logical structure of the Web page in accordance with the request to modify the logical structure (col.15, lines 30-50; options such as adding a page and deleting a page are provided); and

updating the at least one link in accordance with the modified logical structure (col.15, lines 55-56).

As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 14, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 1 above.

As to claim 15, Underwood discloses the presented user interface comprises a form adapted to allow a user to configure the parameters (fig.6-11).

As to claim 16, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 3 above.

As to claim 17, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 4 above.

As to claim 20, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 8 above.

As to claim 22, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 10 above.

As to claim 23, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 18 above.

As to claim 24, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 12 above.

As to claim 25, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 13 above.

As to claim 26, Underwood discloses wherein the templates include templates for at least one of different countries, different organizational sites, intranet sites, extranet sites, or internet sites (fig.9, "635"; different industry types such as "General" and "Manufacturing" are disclosed).

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Underwood in view of Giljum and in further view of Maeno et al. (Maeno, US 7,299,414 B2).

As to claim 27, Underwood and Giljum do not disclose different language components to allow a user to selectively switch among different languages for presentation in generated Web page.

In the same field of endeavor, Maeno discloses different language components to allow a user to selectively switch among different languages for presentation in generated web environment (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Underwood and Giljum and the teaching of Maeno before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the web designer taught by Underwood and Giljum to include multilingual pack taught by Maeno with the motivation being to allow an appropriate language format responsive to the user's need (col.2, lines 30-33).

(10) Response to Argument:

Appellant argues that Underwood in combination with Giljum do not disclose "a request to navigate through links in the web page to a particular location within the web page wherein the received data corresponding to the request to navigate does not include data identifying a navigational structure of the web environment" and "the request to publish content is received in connection with a display of the particular location on a user interface and the identified content is published at the particular location".

In response to Appellant's argument, Underwood discloses that a user selects an icon link in the web page next to the text "We put pizzazz into new product launches." to gain access to a particular location between the icon link and the text "We put pizzazz into new product launches." allowing content to be inserted; wherein the icon link does not include a navigation structure of the web environment, and the identified content/image is published/displayed/inserted at the particular location between the icon link and the

text "We put pizzazz into new product launches." (fig. 23; fig.24; col.16, lines 43-46; col.17, lines 5-26, 43-50)

Appellant argues that there is no motivation to combine Underwood with Giljum because Underwood is directed to users to create websites with out having technical knowledge, and Giljum is directed to provide a decentralized system of allowing multiple publishers to post their own content.

In response to Appellant's argument, Underwood is directed to a system that allows users to self publish web contents with out any specialized knowledge (Underwood, col. 5, lines 1-8) and Giljum is directed to a system that allows non-technical users self publish web contents with out knowledge of HTML (Giljum, col.1, lines 57-60 and lines 65-66). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Underwood and Giljum before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the web site developing interface taught by Underwood to include distributed control and centralized management of a website taught by Giljum with the motivation being to generate a web site creation and maintance tool that apportions responsibility of web site creation and maintenance task to the most appropriate individuals aiding non-technical users to self publish web contents (Giljum, col.1, lines 57-66).

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the Above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Haoshian Shih/

Examiner, Art Unit 2173

/Kieu Vu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2173

/William L. Bashore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175